

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-85 are pending in the above-identified application and are currently under examination. Applicants have reviewed the office action mailed May 21, 2003, and respectfully traverse all grounds of rejection set forth therein.

Figure 3 has been objected to and correction is required allegedly because the substituted sheet filed in Applicant's previous response was missing information present in the originally filed drawing. Entry of the substitute sheet also is alleged to constitute new matter.

Attached as Exhibit A is a proposed drawing corrections for Figure 3. This corrected drawing corresponds substantially to original Figure 3 as filed except that the shaded area of Figure 3 has been removed because of the objection set forth in the previous Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests approval of the proposed drawing corrections and removal of this objection and rejection.

Claims 1-85 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a) as allegedly anticipated by Ideker et al. (2000). Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been rendered moot by the Katz-type Rule 132 Declaration of Drs. Ideker, Thorsson and Siegel, submitted herewith as Exhibit B, establishing that the cited reference describes Applicants' own work. Accordingly, the Ideker et al. (2000) reference is not applicable as prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.